



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ter. When the Romans were to meet the Cimbri and Teutons in the field, their commander had first to accustom them for a whole day to the fearful sight of the wild, giant-like forms.

LUDWIG TIECK ON RAPHAEL'S MADONNA SISTINA.

By C. L. BERNAYS.

So much that is disparaging has been said about the "*Ueberschwänglichkeit*" ["gushing" nature] of the German Romantic authors such as Tieck, Hölderlin, Schlegel and the Stolbergs, and that singular intoxication of their minds, which at the least touch of reality turned into an almost equally singular state of insipidity, has been so much harped upon that it seems to be a hazardous enterprise to vindicate certain very great merits of that school of literary men. It is not my purpose to do, in this respect, for the American public, what has been performed in Germany by many prominent authors of this epoch,—not only for want of time, but because, even if I should succeed in convincing my readers of the great value to the development of the German mind which their half mystical and half thoughtful, half ponderous and half petulant discriminations of every human sentiment undeniably had, it would scarcely have any observable influence upon the culture of this nation.

We are moving here on such an entirely different road, that I cannot see what might be gained if Americans knew that these Romantics were the first to bring Shakspeare to the consciousness of the German world; that they understood Albrecht Dürer and Raphael better than even the Classics who preceded them, and that it was they who found the source of every artistic creation in the devotion of the human heart.

My purpose is much narrower, and attaches itself rather to a practical object. Raphael's Madonna Sistina nowadays is almost a household picture in every cultured American family. And yet, although its wonderful outlines and graceful features most naturally delight every sensitive heart, to explain the motives for the different directions in which the three

principal figures are looking, has puzzled not only ordinary close observers, but even almost every professional art-critic. It was again one of these German Romantics, of whom it was scornfully said that they never look anything in its face, but prefer the discovery of what may be behind it,—who, in the most unassuming way, explained the seeming secret of that admirable picture. It was Ludwig Tieck, who as a young man stood before that picture in the Dresden gallery, and spoke of it in the following terms:

“We were standing in front of Raphael’s so-called *Madonna Sistina*. It is difficult to say anything adequate of so eternal and perfect a creation; the more difficult because enthusiastic admirers and searching connoisseurs have dwelt on it often and with great minuteness.

“All agree that none of Raphael’s pictures were painted with so thin colors, and that none were less elaborate. As it probably was very rapidly finished, it assumed almost the character of a fresco. Should we fix its rank, it stands, perhaps, in advance of all other works of this greatest of painters in simplicity and sublimity. It occurs to me that this sublime conception did not admit of the elaborateness bestowed on many other master-pieces, for this picture has the effect of a holy apparition. It is a pity that it was framed so negligently; for almost a hand’s breadth of the upper part was bent inward, whereby the green curtain and upper light space are shortened. By adding in thought that missing portion of the picture, the whole figure of the Virgin appears to float downward, and is more distinct and more lovely than the figures of Sixtus and Santa Barbara. The vision of the three saints descends into the church. It appears above the altar, and the Virgin, with a serious-looking child in her arms, at the same time moves forward in her descent. This twofold movement explains the floating of the veil and the backward tendency of her blue garment. The transfigured pope, fervently praying, has been from the first in a kneeling position. Santa Barbara stands near the Virgin, blinded, however, by her majesty and almost frightened by the penetrating and thoughtful eyes of the Child. She sinks on her knees and turns away her face. Raphael enjoyed this combination of former and later movements; it is found in almost all his

pictures, and no one ever reached him in the art of carrying true life and spirit into his positions and groups.

"The angels, as heralds, have arrived earlier on the ground, and lean down on the altar as if taking rest. Ingenuously and with childlike sincerity they await the arrival of the saints, and the transparent frankness of childhood contrasts beautifully with the countenance of Christ and the severe earnestness of his eyes. I never could understand the remark of assuming critics who have found something worldly, or even coquettish, in the figure of Barbara. Others imagine that the picture would be still nobler if the Virgin appeared without any company. To very many, who yet love to speak about such things, completeness is a book with seven seals; and it is so, precisely for the reason that it is complete. The majority of men delight only in single features. Whenever in art or poetry something mighty and beautiful is offered to them, they at once endeavor to tear the work to pieces in order to assimilate to themselves this or that, either with coolness or with fervor. The cool ones are the so-called connoisseurs. They very often admire this or that accidental feature with such a flippancy that one becomes inclined to question whether it would not be better that no art and no poetry should confuse this world. The fervid ones sometimes screw themselves up into a passion in order to isolate with the greatest distinctness something really beautiful, which in fact forms an integral part of a work of art. And yet this part deserves their praise, and is reasonable only in case it be explained from the intrinsic nature and the totality of such a work, through which only a work of art deserves that name. Usually, neither the zealots nor the cautious and discreet critics have any understanding. This belief in completeness they condemn as downright superstition; they can admire a work only when they discover an incomplete similitude with that invisible, unintelligible and undetermined Ideal which in a foggy chaos hovers before them.

"It is remarkable how often extremes meet. This Madonna of Raphael should, perhaps, never have been copied; and yet no other picture has ever been drawn so often, or by less capable draughtsmen. The best of them has not had the spiritual eye which would enable him to reproduce the real

figure of the Virgin. Probably the creating master himself would never have succeeded in copying it. Some oil paintings representing only the whole figure of the Virgin have proved the worst. I know some painters who have succeeded in making of this sublime figure only something impudent and vulgar."

LEIBNITZ'S THEODICY.

Abridgment of the Controversy Reduced to Formal Arguments.

Translated from the French of G. W. LEIBNITZ, by A. E. KROGER.

[In connection with the following article of Leibnitz, it may be serviceable to the reader to restate the various points made by Leibnitz in the articles heretofore published from his writings. They are as follows:

1. That the mechanical view of nature, or that view which looks upon all things as merely things in space, or as extended matter, is not sufficient to explain anything; and that, hence, the conception of a metaphysical something else, which is not extended, and which we may call force, must be added to that view.

2. That the insufficiency of explaining by the purely mechanical view arises from this, that every atom is again infinitely divisible, and hence offers no true unities from which alone multiplicity can be explained. Hence along with extended—infininitely divisible—matter we must assume unextended—indivisible—formal atoms, or forces, or entelechies, or souls, or monads, each one whereof is free; and thus, accompanied by or embodied in extended matter, gives to it, the passive, activity: sensation and desire.

3. That, however, we must not account for the phenomena of matter (of the non-Ego) from the conception of the monad (the Ego), but must view material nature altogether empirically, and from the conception of the Ego must derive merely general principles—meaning the universal categories and contemplations under which the empirically perceived phenomena of nature are then to be classified.

4. That the conceptions of beginning and end, birth and death, cannot be applied to the monads or souls, nay, not even to their organic machinery or bodies, since those conceptions furnish no explanation, but postulate miracles; that hence these souls and bodies are perennial and immortal, and that this permanency cannot be a metempsychosis or translation, but only a transformation or augmentation.

5. That the way in which the souls or monads operate upon their material bodies, and thus upon each other, cannot be explained by the category of cause and effect—since that category applies only to the material world—and can be solved only by positing it as an *absolute* mode of operation, or as a pre-established harmony.

6. That, amongst all the monads or souls, there is one class of a superior or moral order, for whose sake "everything else is made," their absolute (moral) activity having indeed an immediate causality over the whole world of nature,